

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Introduction**

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated April 29, 2009, having a shortened statutory period set to expire July 29, 2009. In the present Office Action, Claims 1-5 and 10-14 are canceled by the Examiner, leaving Claims 6-9 pending. In the present Amendment, Applicant has entered new Claims 15-30; thus, Claims 6-9 and 15-30 are now pending.

### **II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

In paragraph 3 of the present Office Action, Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *MacDraw Pro User's Guide*, Claris Corporation (1991), hereinafter *Claris*. That rejection is respectfully traversed, and favorable reconsideration of the claims is requested.

#### **A. Claris does not disclosed the “plurality of graphical pointers” recited in exemplary Claim 6**

Applicant respectfully submits that *Claris* does not render exemplary Claim 6 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (or § 103) because *Claris* does not disclose the “processor system” of Claim 6 set forth as follows:

a processor system that causes the display device to simultaneously display a plurality of graphical pointers within a graphical user interface having one or more windows, wherein each of the plurality of graphical pointers is separate from the one or more windows, graphically movable with respect to the one or more windows, and repositionable independently from the one or more windows.

With reference to the claimed “plurality of graphical pointers,” paragraph 3 of the present Office Action cites the conventional scroll arrows in the vertical and horizontal scroll bars disclosed by *Claris* in Figures 1-17 and 3-24. Clearly, such scroll arrows are not “graphical pointers” as that term is employed by those skilled in the art and therefore are not “separate from the one or more windows, graphically movable with respect to the one or more windows, and

independently repositionable from the one or more windows,” as now recited in Claim 6. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that *Claris* does not render exemplary Claim 6 or its dependent claims unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (or § 103).

**B. *Claris* does not disclose the movement of a graphical pointer with respect to one or more windows of a graphical user interface as recited in exemplary Claim 6**

Applicant respectfully submits that *Claris* also does not render exemplary Claim 6 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (or § 103) because *Claris* does not disclose the following features of Claim 6:

a graphical pointing device interfaced to said processor system such that a temporarily selected graphical pointer among said plurality of graphical pointers is moved with respect to the one or more windows in response to manipulation of said graphical pointing device during said selection.

In particular, Applicant notes that *Claris*' conventional scroll arrows do not “move with respect to the one or more windows in response to manipulation of said graphical pointing device during said selection,” as now recited in Claim 6 as amended. Rather, *Claris*' conventional scroll arrows remain in a fixed position with respect to the graphical windows as the graphical pointing device is manipulated. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that *Claris* does not render exemplary Claim 6 or its dependent claims unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (or § 103).

**C. *Claris* does not disclose the selection of a graphical object underlying a position of a graphical pointer as recited in exemplary Claim 6**

Applicant respectfully submits that *Claris* also does not render exemplary Claim 6 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (or § 103) because *Claris* does not disclose the following features of Claim 6:

a switch associated with said selected graphical pointer among said plurality of graphical pointers, wherein closure of said switch selects a graphical object within said graphical user interface graphically underlying a position of said selected graphical pointer within the graphical user interface.

With reference to the foregoing feature, page 3 of the present Office Action states, "Clicking on one of the scroll arrows would read on selecting a point within the display device because the scroll arrow is a point on the window which is within the display device." As now amended, however, Claim 6 recites "select[ing] a graphical object ... graphically underlying a position of said selected graphical pointer within the graphical user interface." *Claris* does not permit selection of a graphical object utilizing a scroll arrow, and particularly, does not disclose selection of a graphical object underlying a scroll arrow. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that *Claris* does not render exemplary Claim 6 or its dependent claims unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (or § 103).

### **III. Conclusion**

Having now responded to the rejection set forth in the present Office Action, Applicant believes all pending claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such allowance.

No additional fee is believed to be required. If, however, any additional fees are required, please charge those fees to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. **09-0447**.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Brian F. Russell  
Registration No. 40,796  
DILLON & YUDELL LLP  
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy., Ste. 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT